

Appl. No. 09/933,547  
Amdt. Dated November 5, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of September 14, 2004

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed September 14, 2004. In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b); and claims 1-3, 8-10, 11-13, 18-20, 21-23 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In addition, the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter for claims 4-7, 14-17, and 24-27 if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 24, 26 and 28. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103***

1. In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected: (1) claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,349 issued to Klein ("Klein"), (2) 1-3, 8-10, 11-13, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,941,970 issued to Lange ("Lange") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,082 issued to Murdoch et al. ("Murdoch"), and (3) 21-23 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein, in view of Lange, and further in view of Murdoch. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and contends that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation and obviousness.

Applicant reiterates the arguments presented in the previous response.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner states that "[t]he claim language merely claims the circuits configured according to the bus frequency" (final Office Action, page 8, item 8). The Examiner further states that Klein discloses RAM (figure 4, structure 108) for buffering the data transmission between the two bus. "Since each data transmission will allocate the necessary buffer due to the different in the bus frequencies, the input and output circuit s cooperate with the buffer controlling means to accommodate the data transmission from different bus frequencies; hence the circuit is dynamically configured based on the bus frequency" (final Office Action, page 8, item 8). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As argued in the previous response, element 108 in Figure 4 is the main memory. The system controller accesses the main memory via a memory address and control bus, and transfers data to and from the main memory

Appl. No. 09/933,547  
Amdt. Dated November 5, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of September 14, 2004

via a memory data bus (Klein, col. 4, lines 29-32). The main memory is not one of the buffers. Although the claims may be interpreted broadly during prosecution, the claim interpretations must be consistent with the specification. The specification clearly indicates that the buffers are not the system memory (See, for example; Figure 1, element 192 and 140). Furthermore, claim 21 clearly recites the buffer circuit to be in a chipset separate from the memory.

The Examiner further states that Murdoch discloses that it is known to use the buffer to transmit data between buses with different frequencies, citing the Abstract in Murdoch. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Murdoch does not disclose input and output circuits dynamically configured according to the bus frequencies. Murdoch merely discloses transferring a packet from first bus to a second bus. If a portion has not been transferred, the controller causes at least one wait state to be inserted on the second bus. Inserting a wait state does not change the frequency of the bus. Wait state is used merely to delay the cycle to allow time for the packet to be transferred to the bus.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 11, 21 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner objects to claims 4-7, 14-17, and 24-27 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicates that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended dependent claims 4, 14, and 24 to include all of the limitations of the independent claims and any intervening dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests that newly amended independent claims 4, 14, and 24 and all claims that depend therefrom be allowed.

Appl. No. 09/933,547  
Amdt. Dated November 5, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of September 14, 2004

### *Conclusion*

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 5, 2004

By

  
Thinh V. Nguyen

Reg. No. 42,034

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*

#### **MAILING**

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

#### **FACSIMILE**

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: November 5, 2004

  
Tu Nguyen

November 5, 2004

Date